The Press in The Soviet Bloc: An Open Letter to Tass on the Marton Case, See Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IV, NO. 3 JANUARY 23, 1956 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Where the Democrats Really Agree With Dulles

In the uproar over the *Life* interview with Mr. Dulles, the realities of American foreign policy are being overlooked. This account of how war was ended in Korea and Indo-China and peace maintained over Quemoy and Matsu is a day-dream put on by Mr. Dulles to allay *Life's* suspicions about the Republicans. The editorial in the same issue shows *Life* is disturbed because "Ike's new message sounds nostalgic for the spirit of Geneva." It believes "the Democrats will do us all a service by concentrating their vigilance and their needling on any signs of softness . . . in our foreign policy." But because of the Dulles interview, *Life* concludes that "the case against Republican complacency toward the Communist threat is not an open and shut one." Such are the uses of bedtime stories.

Dulles Lost in The Showdowns

Mr. Lippmann commented that U.S. foreign policy "has been more realistic and more responsible than any one would suppose" from reading the *Life* article. He might have added that this is so because Mr. Dulles, though Secretary of State, has very fortunately not been the prime molder of American foreign policy; on the contrary, peace has been made and maintained because he has on the crucial occasions been overruled. One such occasion was that hectic conference in Paris with Eden and Mendes-France July 13-14, 1954, when the latter wanted American support for his plan to end the Indo-Chinese fighting. Dulles, checking twice with Eisenhower by transatlantic phone, largely reversed his resolve to 'dissociate' the U.S. from the Indo-Chinese phase of the Geneva conference. A second occasion was at the National Security Council meeting in Denver in September of 1954 when Eisenhower overruled the Dulles-Radford proposal for aerial attack on the Chinese mainland in defense of Quemoy-Matsu, and decided instead to see what could be done by UN mediation. The Administration has wavered and wobbled but in the showdowns Mr. Dulles has been on the losing side with Radford, Knowland and Nixon.

Nixon's Foolhardy Defense

The Vice President's defense of the Secretary of State indicates what really happened; nobody seems to have noticed that Mr. Nixon put his foot in his mouth as energetically as Mr. Dulles. "The test of a foreign policy," said Mr. Nixon, "is its ability to keep the peace without surrendering any territory or any principle." By this test the Eisenhower Administration comes out badly. It "gave away" half of Korea and half of Indo-China for the sake of peace, and has hinted that it would "give away" Quemoy and Matsu if Peking acquiesced in our possession of Formosa. Indeed most Democrats, far from applauding the defeat of Mr. Dulles on these occasions, have grumbled about the price. Just last week, Senator Humphrey in his attack on the *Life* interview, spoke of the peace in Indo-China as "that very unfortunate settlement." The dominant Democratic-Liberal-Labor view, in all its opportunist demagogy and dangerous contradiction, was expressed by Reuther at the CIO convention in December, 1954 when he complained that "Dulles . . . frightened the free world with his talk of massive retaliation" (a complaint which seemed to imply support for peace) but added in the next breath that "in Indo-China America's policy seemed closer to appeasement than to all-out militant resistance" (which implied that it would have been preferable to intervene and step up the fighting).

The Idiot's Refrain

The Democrats, for all their criticism, really agree with Nixon that the test of a foreign policy is its ability "to keep the peace without surrendering any territory or any principle." The American public has been sold the idea, first by Mr. Acheson and then by Mr. Dulles, that if only we pile up big enough air fleets and bombs we can dictate terms, without ever having to meet our adversaries halfway in negotiations. This view is so strongly entrenched by now that the crises of the past three years have had to be resolved almost surreptitiously. George and Stevenson and Russell and Byrd on the Democratic side, Secretaries Humphrey and Wilson and former President Hoover on the Republican side, have all played a part in holding Eisenhower's hand on a course toward peace. But nobody has dared to express the view publicly that peace requires compromise. Compromise is "appeasement." This is the idiot's refrain that drowns out every attempt to talk sense.

Axis Appeaser Turned "Christian Crusader"

I have always regarded Mr. Dulles with repugnance as an unctuous old fraud. His ability to switch over from his cynical prewar defense of Japanese and German expansion (1932 to 1941) and reappear (from 1943 on) as a Christian crusader shows how easily the American press can be duped. It would be a national blessing if the *Life* article should force Mr. Dulles out of his job. But I see no disposition on the part of the Democrats to challenge him on any of the fundamental issues of foreign policy—on H-bomb tests, on Formosa, on our insistence that a unified Germany must join NATO, or on his determination to prevent elections this year in Indo-China. Not to grapple with any of these concrete and urgent problems, to leave all these time bombs ticking away, to be vocal only about the need for ever bigger arms appropriations, to provide a claque for the aviation lobby and Ridgway, is to drift toward war and hope that on the brink the adversary will give in rather than fight. This is, as Stevenson termed it, "Russian roulette." The trouble is that the Democrats play it, too. *Life* and Dulles have merely stated it too baldly for their comfort.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Checking Dulles's Version of the Korean Truce Against the Known Facts

Was Ike "Calm and Ready" to Start World War III at Rhee's Pleasure?

The Dulles article in *Life* said Eisenhower decided while returning from Korea on the battleship *Helena* in December 1952 that if truce negotiations failed we would attack Manchuria with atomic weapons. Our allies in the UN command, the article said, "would be informed of these decisions when and if the time came to implement them. . . ." Notice that they were to be *"informed,"* not consulted.

The Republicans had been extremely critical of Mr. Truman for taking us into the Korean "police action" without the declaration of war by Congress which the Constitution requires. These decisions would have meant war with China, and therefore possibly with China's ally, the Soviet Union, i.e. World War III. Can Dulles have been serious in telling *Life* the new Administration was prepared to plunge in this without consulting either our allies or Congress?

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, Secretary of Defense Wilson and Gen. Lucius D. Clay were among those participating in the conferences on the *Helena*. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee ought to ask them whether this story is true. If it is, then the incoming Eisenhower Administration was guilty at its very inception of plotting to violate its obligations to Congress, and to the United Nations under whose authority we were presumably fighting the Korean war.

Just A Secret Between Us and Peking

This story is made to look silly by what follows immediately after. Our allies would be "informed of these decisions when and if the time came to implement them, but meanwhile it was urgent to make sure that the Reds would not again act out of miscalculation." We weren't telling our allies but we were going to tell Red China!

The *Life* article says that "characteristically" Dulles "undertook personally to see that this was done." He went to New Delhi and told Nehru, feeling sure about the latter's "ability to communicate speedily with Peking." Sure enough, "within two weeks after his trip to New Delhi, Dulles received word from Korea that the Reds appeared to have begun to negotiate seriously."

The stumbling block, according to the *Life* article, was Peking's insistence that "22,000" North Korean and Chinese prisoners be returned whether they wished to go home or not. "Dulles had made it clear," *Life* said, "that the U. S. was standing firm on a principle of justice and that no prisoner would be returned against his will. So it was necessary for the Communists to retreat on this issue if a resumption of the war was to be avoided." While a way out was sought, Rhee released the prisoners, hoping—so the *Life* story relates—that this "would force the Communists to break off the negotiations and the war would be resumed."

So what happened then? "Dulles picked up the direct phone to the White House," *Life* says, "and asked the White House operator to awaken the President. He told Eisenhower of Rhee's action and briefly stated the implications. Dulles found the President calm and ready. The *Helena* decision was reaffirmed. The Manchurian targets had already been carefully selected so as to limit them to areas of clear military importance.

"But the North Koreans and the Red Chinese did *not* walk out of the conference," *Life* goes on. "They continued to negotiate. . . . They did so, Dulles believes, because they had had unmistakable warning that further delays would no longer be met with U.S. indecisiveness. Thirty-nine days later the truce was signed."

This certainly distorts the sequence of events. Dulles visited Nehru May 20 to May 22 of 1953. But Chou En-lai had already given in on the principle of voluntary repatriation almost two months earlier on March 30 in a statement appealing for a resumption of the truce talks and an exchange of sick and wounded prisoners held by both sides. On April 26, April 29 and May 8 further concessions were made by the Communist negotiators.

So Ike Knows How The Press Feels

"More accustomed to the quick, crisp manner of a military briefing officer than to the thoughtful pauses of Dulles, Eisenhower was once heard to exclaim, 'Why doesn't he [Dulles] speak up faster and say what he has on his mind?'"

—Life's article, "How Dulles Averted War"

A Rescue Worse Than Defeat

"There is no doubt that Radford had alerted the Navy. One officer aboard a carrier was prepared to parachute into Dien Bien Phu to instruct the French garrison on how to protect itself once the atomic bombs began to fall around the fort."

—Washington Post (Jan. 14) on the Life article.

"Whether or not it would ever have been practical to use atomic tactical weapons in the battle must remain a matter for dispute. But many people felt, and still feel, that in a situation such as that in Dien Bien Phu where the besiegers were in close contact with the besieged, and in some cases had actually overrun them, an intervention with atomic weapons would have caused greater death and destruction than was caused in the battle itself, without achieving anything."

—Paris dispatch on Life, London Times, (Jan. 13).

It Was Seoul That Needed Threatening

By the time Dulles reached New Delhi on May 20, the remaining obstacles were not with Peking but with Seoul. As soon as an agreement came into sight, Rhee threatened to carry on the war alone, and finally boycotted the Panmunjom sessions. All through May and into June, the Eisenhower Administration's headache was Rhee's intransigeance. When the prisoner of war agreement was finally signed by Generals Harrison and Nam Il on June 8, Rhee's representative did not sign it, though even Taft and Knowland pleaded with Rhee to go along.

It strains the limits of credulity to be told that after all those weeks of anguished negotiation with Rhee, Dulles found the President "calm and ready" to drop atom bombs on Manchuria when the Secretary of State woke him up with the news that Rhee had upset the apple cart by releasing the prisoners just as peace came into sight. It is easier to believe that the President's reaction was sulphurous, and that it was Rhee on whom he felt like dropping a bomb that morning.

If the President was ready to drop bombs on Manchuria, he certainly kept it a secret. A world-wide wave of alarm was stirred by Rhee's action. President Eisenhower at once sent a "secret but sharply worded message" of protest to Rhee (N. Y. *Times*, June 19, 1953).

There was an alarmed session of the National Security Council on June 18 after which Dulles described Rhee's action as "a violation of the authority of the UN command." That night he tried to reassure a meeting of all the Ambassadors representing those countries with troops in Korea. World-wide condemnation of Rhee saved face for Peking, and made it possible to bring about a cease-fire on July 26.

Everything the Administration did in those hectic hours gave Congress, the country, our allies and the world the impression that the Eisenhower Administration would not permit Rhee to upset the truce talks just as they neared completion. There was not the slightest hint of a decision to meet the situation by threatening an atomic bombardment of Manchuria. Either the Administration engaged in an extraordinarily elaborate deception or Dulles is not telling the truth.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Open Letter to The Editors of Tass on the Marton Case

The One World of Co-Existence Requires One Standard of Justice

To the Editors of Tass:

There are American citizens working in this country for Tass and the Soviet press. Suppose one of them were suddenly to disappear. Suppose that weeks later there was a curt announcement by the American government that he had been arrested on suspicion of espionage for the Soviet intelligence service. Suppose Tass made efforts to learn the exact charges without success, was unable to contact its employe or obtain legal advice for him. Suppose months later it were announced that he had been tried by an American military court, found guilty and sentenced to six years in prison.

Would you be content to accept that verdict without knowing where and when the trial had been held, the nature of the evidence, the character of the proceeding? You may rest assured that not only newspapermen like myself but many conservative American papers would protest such conduct by our authorities as high-handed, and demand the fullest kind of investigation.

The hypothetical case put before you is almost exactly that of the Hungarian newspaperman, Endre Marton, correspondent of the Associated Press in Budapest during the past eight years. Indeed the Marton case is worse because the police also arrested his wife, Ilona, correspondent for the United Press. Their two small daughters were "orphaned" by the arrests. If our authorities had acted this way, would you not have denounced them as barbarous?

Your Police Have Been Wrong Before

Dr. Marton dropped out of sight 11 months ago. The last telephone contact with his wife was June 19. The Hungarian government announced July 9 that both had been arrested on suspicion "of having carried out espionage for the American intelligence service." Then almost seven months later came an announcement by the Budapest radio January 14 that Dr. Marton had been sentenced by a military court to six, his wife to three years in jail.

Even the date of the trial was not given. The Associated Press said reports reaching Vienna last Fall declared the Martons and three other persons had been tried November 28 "but that Hungarian authorities prohibited disclosure of the verdicts in the press."

For all we know the Martons may be guilty. But we would not accept a verdict from our own government under such circumstances. That your secret police are as prone to error and injustice as any other was dramatically shown by the reversal of the "doctors' plot" and later the execution of Beria himself as an "imperialist agent"; Hungary confessed error when it freed Noel and Herta Field, who had been convicted in the famous Raik trial. This could be an "error," too.

If There Is To Be Co-Existence

We asked the Hungarian Embassy whether the Martons were tried publicly or secretly, whether they had counsel, whether they had a right of appeal, whether a transcript of the trial was available. The Embassy through its press secretary said all it knew was what the American papers had printed the day before. Maybe Tass can find out what the American press can't.

At a time when press relations between East and West have been improving, the Marton case is a setback. If the charges are to be taken seriously, then the Hungarian government owes it to world opinion and to the cause of better relations to publish the full facts and to give the Associated Press and the United Press the right to contact their employes directly in prison, to retain counsel for them, and to bring an appeal if they believe one justified.

It is in the profound conviction that peaceful coexistence is the most urgent necessity of the human race that we appeal to Tass to investigate. The world must slowly become one, and if it is to be one we cannot have one standard of justice on one side and another standard on the other.

Particular emphasis must be laid on freedom of information and of communication. Of course, this does not give a right to spy. But newspapermen must not be at the mercy of espionage charges by governments which may not like what they write nor at the mercy of laws which equate news gathering with espionage.

—I. F. STONE

CORRECTION

Through an error last week Seymour Peck was referred to as one of the three men discharged by the *New York Times* last year after appearances before Congressional committees. This was an error; Jack Shafer should have been named as one of the three on whose behalf we appealed.

Could the Prohibitionists Have Investigated the Press for Alcoholics?

A Senator, Himself A Newspaperman, Attacks Congressional Inquisition Into The Press

"Of course, Mr. President, the hearings which have recently been concluded, but which may be revised soon, I understand, have been defended as an investigation not of the press, but of communism. We have recently lived through a period when, apparently, any person or institution could be pilloried by investigation if charged in any quarter whatsoever with alleged communism. There have been investigations of charges of Communist infiltration into churches, but, of course, not an investigation of churches. Yet, Mr. President, under the open-book charges now in vogue, what is to prevent a committee which is bigoted against a certain church or religion from looking for communism in that particular church? . . . What if some other committee decided to probe alleged disloyalty on the staffs of certain newspapers which were suggesting opposition to a unanimous verdict of the United States Supreme Court? . . .

"But, Mr. President, it is both wrong and dangerous to encourage the inference that occasional newspaper employees with Communist backgrounds have shaped the press into a tool of a totalitarian conspiracy. It is wrong, because it takes no congressional investigators to know that the exact opposite is the case. It is dangerous, because it points the way to coercive pressure on the editorial policies of any newspaper which offends temporarily anyone in the position to investigate. It creates the threat that, by the very act of investigating one newspaper and not another, a congressional committee or grand jury may single out a segment of the press which reports facts or favors editorial policies not in agreement with those of a particular committee.

"A committee in favor of public power could probe the personnel of a newspaper sympathetic to the private utility companies. A committee with a majority favorable to racial integration might decide to question the employees of a newspaper which promoted continued segregation in the public schools. If a newspaper supports liberalization of our immigration laws, a committee opposing that step may decide to investigate whether foreign-born citizens have conspired to infiltrate the press. When many newspapers supported the 21st amendment, should congressional supporters of continuing prohibition have undertaken the investigation of alcoholism among journalists and linotype operators?"

—*Sen. Richard Neuberger (D. Ore.) in the Senate, Jan. 12*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the Civil Liberties Front: The Real Issue in the Lightfoot "Membership" Decision

Ex-Communist Screen Writer Gets Passport Without "Naming Names"

The backdown of the State Department in the Carl Foreman case was a defeat not only for the Department but for the Senate Internal Security Committee. The rule applied by the Department in the past to passport applicants who claim to be ex-Communists is that set forth by the Eastland committee in its latest report on the Communist party. "A test of the individual's sincerity," the report says, "is his willingness to expose his associates in the ranks of the Communist conspiracy."* Foreman, the screen writer who produced "High Noon" and "Home of the Brave" (and has been living in the home of the braver British), was refused renewal of his passport when he declined to "prove his sincerity" by naming others. Suit was brought on his behalf by Sidney E. Cohn and Eugene Gressman but the Department cabled our Embassy in London to issue a passport for Foreman and his wife just as the case was about to be tried. No doubt it feared another adverse decision like that in the Leonard Boudin passport case in which the Court of Appeals has already ruled that the Department in denying passports must produce its evidence and cannot rely on faceless informers.

The conviction of Claude Mack Lightfoot under the membership clause of the Smith Act was unanimously upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals in Chicago last week. This was the second ruling of its kind, the first being that in the case of Junius Irving Scales whose conviction was upheld last Fall by the Court of Appeals in Baltimore (see the *Weekly* last November 17 for comment). Lightfoot like Scales was not only a member but an official of the Communist party and the Court stressed the fact that he was "not a mine-run member . . . nor was he an innocent worker . . . Lightfoot was an intelligent, crusading Communist. . . ." We hope the Supreme Court will pass upon these membership cases. All the earlier convictions were for *conspiracy* to advocate at some future date; Scales and Lightfoot were convicted for *membership* in a party which is presumed (on the basis largely of books written by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin) to teach and advocate. Nobody has yet been prosecuted for actually himself advocating revolutionary doctrine. No matter how you slice it, whether by conspiracy or membership, this is a long way from the traditional idea that a man may advocate what he pleases, so long as he does not by overt act commit or attempt to commit a crime against public order.

There was further evidence last week of an improving climate in the courts. The Supreme Court granted a hearing to Oleta O'Connor Yates, one of the California Smith Act victims, from a one year sentence for contempt; Mrs. Yates was in and out of jail for months as she steadily refused while herself on trial to identify others as Communists. The Court last week, speaking through Mr. Justice **Frankfurter**, held that a naturalized citizen could not be required under the McCarran-Walter Act to appear as a witness in a proceeding which might lead to his own denaturalization. A 5-4 decision in another case indicated the lineaments of a new moderately liberal majority and of a rightist minority. Harlan (with Reed, Burton and Minton) dissented from an opinion by Douglas strictly construing the search and seizure safeguards of the Constitution against the prosecution and in favor of the accused in a marihuana case. The immediate issue was highly technical, but the Court's lineup pretty accurately reflected the sympathies of the Judges. The new Justice, Harlan, gravitates naturally to the right, as we predicted he would when he was appointed. . . . In another encouraging ruling here last week, the U.S. Court of Appeals reversed the contempt conviction of Saul Grossman, an official of the Michigan Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born.

* In this, as in other respects, the current inquisition recalls its older ecclesiastical counterpart. "The accused," the Encyclopaedia Britannica says of the Inquisition, "was bound to denounce all those who were partners of his heresy, or whom he suspected or knew to be heretics. If he confessed, and denounced his accomplices, relatives or friends, he was 'reconciled' with the Church."

Why the New H-Bomb Blast

Washington—That flood of stories about the new H-bomb explosions being for defensive purposes is based on off the record not-for-attribution interviews with favored reporters designed to allay public misgivings about further tests. The real reason for the tests (and the smaller size) H-bomb to be used seems to be that we have not yet tested an H-bomb by dropping one from a plane as the Russians did. Our last H-bomb blast was of a monster so huge and cumbersome that it had to be set up on the ground for detonation. It could be used in war if the enemy kindly consented to let us put it up alongside the target and granted visas to the technicians required to set it off.

Send A Gift Sub with Your Renewal and Bring Some Friend Back to the Ranks of Active Liberalism

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:
1/23/56

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED